



**MORE ON THE STRUGGLE OF TWO LINES
LENIN'S LECTURE ON THE STATE
VITAL ROLE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
ALBANIAN YOUTH
PEOPLE'S WAR (GENERAL GIAP)**

WYOMING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

C O N T E N T S

More on the Struggle of Two Lines — National Secretariat, C.P.N.Z.	Page 5
Lenin's Lecture on the State	Page 8
The Struggle for the Triumph of Marxism-Leninism over Bourgeois Ideology — The Motive Force of the Revolutionary Movement World-Wide	Page 23
Albanian Youth — A Revolutionary Shock Force — Enver Hoxha	Page 26
People's War (Part 4). — General Vo Nguyen Giap.	Page 28

Published 4/7/73.

Registered at the G.P.O., Wellington, as a Magazine.

Published by the In Print Publishing Co. Ltd., 139 Albert St., Auckland;
and printed by Wilson Printery Ltd., 139 Albert St., Auckland.

More on the Struggle of Two Lines

National Secretariat, C.P.N.Z.

Last issue we stressed the need to understand what we mean by the struggle between two lines within the party.

In essence of course this is a struggle between Marxist-Leninist practice and theory and bourgeois concepts of organisation and ideology. But this struggle must be waged against many errors, ranging from sheer right opportunism to its twin brother — left sectarianism.

The first point all comrades must get clearly in mind is that after the world split in the international Communist movement (1960-63), those who rejected revisionism and took a Marxist-Leninist line had not, nor could have, eliminated the struggle within the parties and groups. The conflict in fact continued and has intensified everywhere, both within the socialist countries such as China and Albania and within the capitalist ones. The same situation naturally exists inside our party. We too reflected the deepening of the class struggle and it was for this reason that the C.P.N.Z. has called for study of "On Practice" and "On Contradiction" by Mao, as well as older classics of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. We feel that the republishing of Mao's "Rectify the Party's Style of Work" in a past "C.R." was of great importance, but it will only prove of value if it is not only studied but put into practice under the conditions of N.Z. capitalism.

All the time we must be prepared to take an objective view of our various activities directed towards progress on the road to the N.Z. socialist revolution, and we must also be critical when necessary as well as objectively self-critical.

It is essential that comrades do not pick on isolated points from the Marxist classics and view them as things in themselves, apart from the present conditions.

Take the question of "One divides into two". This is an important Marxist-Leninist dialectical approach, stressed by Mao Tse-tung, but it does not mean that one divides into two at every meeting, branch, district or National, as some of our good comrades seem to think. The dividing occurs at certain nodal points. Perpetual subdivision will not strengthen our Party at any level and if pursued will only lead to anarchy and disruption, not to a strong Party based on Democratic Centralism as Lenin saw it.

In all our work, particularly when criticising or attempting self-criticism, we must guard against personal subjectivism. It is very easy to be subjective without realising it, but such an approach ne-

gates both the criticism and the basic principles of a Party of Democratic centralism. We end up with neither the necessary democracy nor the equally necessary centralism.

What follows deals with this aspect.

In our New Zealand conditions, Marxism-Leninism is struggling to develop in a hostile bourgeois ideological environment. We have to struggle increasingly to overcome the effects of bourgeois ideas penetrating back into the ranks of our Party.

Therefore, the concept of the struggle of two lines within our Party is a correct one. This concept of the struggle between the two lines is a necessary and a good weapon, but if we use such a weapon in a wrong way, harm can come out of it. We must all examine our practice and study Marxism-Leninism in order to strengthen the Party and develop the revolutionary consciousness of the working people. If our Party adopts this correct approach, our attitude within the Party must be one of mutual assistance in overcoming shortcomings for the general well-being and unity of the Party as a whole. We must always work within the concepts of Marxist-Leninist principles. While centralism must always be the dominant aspect of the organisational principles of a Marxist-Leninist Party, we must also ensure that democracy within the Party is carried out. This entails the necessary information and explanations to overcome differences of opinion, examination of practice, criticism and self-criticism and discussion within the Party. There must be neither centralism without democracy nor democracy without centralism. Both aspects must serve the interests of the Party and the revolutionary movement, guarding the Party's monolithic character, its unity of will and mass line methods thus keeping close contact and good order both inside the Party and with the broad mass movement. As Comrade Mao points out in "Rectify the Party's Style of Work":—"we must keep our ranks in good order, we must march in step".

The question of the relations within the Party is a vital one and is part of a concept of struggle to attain unity and bring theory to a higher level and leading to further struggle in a process of all-round Marxist-Leninist developments. Ideas based on individualism and self-interest are the chief barriers to the correct concepts of struggle, unity in a Marxist-Leninist concept of overcoming the old and developing the new.

Within the framework of such a struggle, and if carried out correctly, there should be no question of the situation developing into an antagonistic one. If this should happen, we would defeat the purpose of the struggle to clarify the Marxist-Leninist line against the bourgeois line.

While we have many problems to overcome in the Party relating to organisation, ideology, application, there is general agreement with the political line of the Party and the general organisational principles of democratic centralism; therefore, we should see the pre-

sent contradictions as being contradictions among the people, and not of an antagonistic nature.

On the other hand, with the Manson-Bailey group, there was a non-acceptance of the line of the Party. They had an alternative line for which they struggled. In this they cast aside the Marxist-Leninist principles of democratic centralism creating an atmosphere of anarchy and among other things attempted to seize the leadership of the Party. Such actions placed them outside the camp of Marxism-Leninism. Thus they became enemies of Marxism-Leninism and that struggle developed into an antagonistic one.

We have republished Comrade Mao's work, on "Rectify the Party's Style of Work", because the Political Committee considers it the most appropriate theoretical work dealing with the present problems facing the Party. We are asking ALL comrades and Party organisations to study it with the particular problem in mind. There is also the very valuable introduction by the National Secretariat to Comrade Mao's article and this also should receive close attention because it deals with the concrete situation of our New Zealand Party. Both the introduction of the National Secretariat, and Comrade Mao's study are an integral part of the ideological and political line of our Party. It is the line of clarifying Marxism-Leninism in the minds of Party members and its application to our practice.

It is important that we all approach the study of our present problems with the correct ideological outlook in mind; unity through struggle — non antagonistic. "Learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones", and "cure the illness to save the patient".

If we do that, we need not fear that the skies will fall, and we will succeed in raising the level of our Marxist-Leninist understanding, overcome aspects of subjectivism, sectarianism, and the present formalism expressed in writing, study, and in a great deal of our routine work.

Revolution Inevitable

The socialist system will eventually replace the capitalist system; this is an objective law independent of man's will. However much the reactionaries try to hold back the wheel of history, sooner or later revolution will take place and will inevitably triumph.

Mao Tsetung.

Lenin's Lecture on the State

(This speech was made by V. I. Lenin, to the students of the Sverdlov University on July 11th, 1919).

Comrades, according to the plan adopted by you and conveyed to me, the subject of today's talk is the state. I do not know how familiar you are already with this subject. If I am not mistaken, your courses have only just begun, and this is the first time you have had to approach this subject systematically. If that is so, then it may very well be that I may not succeed in the first lecture on this difficult subject in making my exposition sufficiently clear and comprehensible to many of my hearers. And if this should prove to be the case, I would request you not to be perturbed by the fact, because the question of the state is a most complex and difficult one, perhaps one that more than any other has been confused by bourgeois scholars, writers and philosophers. It should not, therefore, be expected that a clear understanding of this subject can be obtained from one brief talk, at a first sitting.

After the first talk on this subject you should make a note of the passages which you have not understood, or which are not clear to you, and return to them a second, a third and a fourth time, so that what you have not understood may be further supplemented and explained afterwards, both by reading and by various lectures and talks. I hope that we may manage to meet once again, and that then we shall be able to exchange opinions on all supplementary questions and to see what has remained most unclear.

I also hope that in addition to talks and lectures you will devote some time to reading at least some of the most important works of Marx and Engels. I have no doubt that these most important works are to be found in the catalogues of literature and in the handbooks which are available to the pupils of the Soviet and Party school; and although, again, some of you may at first be dismayed by the difficulty of the exposition, I must again warn you that you should not be perturbed by this fact, and that what is unclear at a first reading, will become clear at a second reading, or when you subsequently approach the question from a somewhat different angle. For I once more repeat that the question is so complex and has been so confused by bourgeois scholars and writers that anybody who desires to study this question seriously, and to master it independently, must attack it several times, return to it again and again and consider the question from various angles in order to attain a clear and definite understanding of it. And it will be all the easier to return to this question because it is such a fundamental, such a basic question of all politics, and because not only in such stormy and revolutionary times as the present, but even in the most

peaceful times, you will come across this question in any newspaper in connection with any economic or political question.

Every day, in one connection or another, you will be returning to this question: what is the state, what is its nature, what is its significance, and what is the attitude of our Party, the Party that is fighting for the overthrow of capitalism, the Communist Party — what is its attitude to the state? And the chief thing is that as a result of your reading, as a result of the talks and lectures you will hear on the state, you should acquire the ability to approach this question independently, since you will be meeting this question on the most varied occasions, in connection with the most trifling questions, in the most unexpected conjunctures, and in discussions and disputes with opponents. Only when you learn to find your way about independently in this question may you consider yourself sufficiently confirmed in your convictions and able with sufficient success to defend them against anybody and at any time.

After these brief remarks, I shall proceed to deal with the question itself — what is the state, how did it arise, and what fundamentally should be the attitude to the state of the Party of the working class, which is fighting for the complete overthrow of capitalism — the Communist Party?

I have already said that you will scarcely find another question which has been so confused, deliberately or not, by the representatives of bourgeois science, philosophy, jurisprudence, political economy and journalism, as the question of the state. To this day, this question is very often confused with religious questions; not only representatives of religious doctrines (it is quite natural to expect it of them) but even people who consider themselves free from religious prejudice, very often confuse the special question of the state with questions of religion, and endeavour to build up a doctrine — often a complex one, with an ideological, philosophical approach and foundation — which claims that the state is something divine, something supernatural, that it is a certain force, by virtue of which mankind has lived, and which confers on people, or which can confer on people, which brings with it, something that is not of man, but is given him from without — that it is a force of divine origin. And it must be said that this doctrine is so closely bound up with the interests of the exploiting classes — the landlords and the capitalists — so serves their interests, has so deeply permeated all the customs, views and science of the gentlemen who represent the bourgeoisie, that you will meet with relics of it on every hand, even the view of the state held by the Mensheviks and Socialist- Revolutionaries, who reject with disgust the suggestion that they are under the sway of religious prejudices, and are convinced that they can regard the state with sober eyes.

This question has been so confused and complicated because it affects the interests of the ruling classes more than any other (yielding in this respect only to the foundations of economic

science). The doctrine of the state serves as a justification of social privilege, a justification of the existence of exploitation, a justification of the existence of capitalism — and that is why it would be the greatest mistake to expect impartiality on this question, to approach this question in the belief that people who claim to be scientific can give you a purely scientific view on the subject. When you have become familiar with this question and have gone into it sufficiently deeply, you will always discern in the question of the state, in the doctrine of the state, in the theory of the state, the mutual struggle of different classes, a struggle which is reflected or expressed in the conflict of views on the state, in the estimate of the role and significance of the state.

To approach this question as scientifically as possible we must cast at least a fleeting glance back on the history of the rise and development of the state. The most reliable thing in a question of social science and one that is most necessary in order really to acquire the habit of approaching this question correctly and not allowing oneself to get lost in the mass of detail or in the immense variety of conflicting opinions — the most important thing in order to approach this question scientifically is not to forget the underlying historical connection, to examine every question from the standpoint of how the given phenomenon arose in history and what principal stages this phenomenon passed through in its development, and, from the standpoint of its development, to examine what the given thing has become today.

I hope, that in connection with the question of the state, you will acquaint yourselves with Engels' book, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. This is one of the fundamental works of modern socialism, every phase of which can be accepted with confidence, in the assurance that it has not been said at random, but is based on immense historical and political material. Undoubtedly, not all the parts of this work have been expounded in an equally popular and comprehensible way; some of them assume that the reader already possesses certain knowledge of history and economics. But I again repeat that you should not be perturbed if, on reading this work, you do not understand it at once. That hardly happens to anyone. But returning to it later, when your interest has been aroused, you will succeed in understanding the greater part of it, if not the whole of it. I mention this book because it gives the correct approach to the question in the sense mentioned. It begins with an historical sketch of the origin of the state.

In order to approach this question correctly, as every other question, for example, the question of the origin of capitalism, the exploitation of man by man. Socialism, how socialism arose, what conditions gave rise to it — every such question can be approached soundly and confidently only if we cast a glance back on the history of its development as a whole. In connection with this question, it should first of all be noted that the state has not always existed.

There was a time when there was no state. It appears wherever and whenever a division of society into classes appears, whenever exploiters and exploited appear.

Before the first form of exploitation of man by man arose, the first form of division into classes — slave-owners and slaves — there existed the patriarchal family, or, as it is sometimes called, the clan family. Fairly definite traces of these primitive times have survived in the life of many primitive peoples; and if you take any work whatsoever on primitive culture, you will always come across more or less definite descriptions, indications and recollections of the fact that there was a time, more or less similar to primitive Communism, when the division of society into slaveowners and slaves did not exist. And in those times there was no state, no special apparatus for the systematic application of force and the subjugation of people by force. Such an apparatus is called the state.

In primitive society, when people still lived in small tribes and were still at the lowest stages of their development, in a condition approximating to savagery — an epoch from which modern, civilised human society is separated by several thousands of years — there were yet no signs of the existence of a state. We find the predominance of custom, authority, respect, the power enjoyed by the elders of the tribe; we find this power sometimes accorded to women* — the position of women then was not like the unfranchised and oppressed condition of women today—but nowhere do we find a special category of people who are set apart to rule others and who, in the interests and with the purpose of rule, systematically and permanently command a certain apparatus of coercion, an apparatus of violence, such as is represented at the present time, as you all realise, by the armed detachments of troops, the prisons and the other means of subjugating the will of others by force — all that which constitutes the essence of the state.

If we abstract ourselves from the so-called religious teachings, subtleties, philosophical arguments and the various opinions advanced by bourgeois scholars, and try to get at the real essence of the matter, we shall find that the state really does amount to such an apparatus of rule separated out from human society. When there appears such a special group of men who are occupied with ruling and nothing else, and who, in order to rule, need a special apparatus of coercion and of subjugating the will of others by force — prisons, special detachments of men, armies, etc. — there appears the state.

But there was a time when there was no state, when general ties, society itself, discipline and the ordering of work were maintained by force of custom and tradition, or by the authority, or the respect enjoyed by the elders of the tribe or by women — who in those times not only frequently enjoyed equal status with men.

* This is a reference to the form of society known as 'matriarchy', for an account of which the reader is referred to F. Engels: *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. —Ed.

but not infrequently enjoyed even a higher status — and when there was no special category of persons, specialists in ruling. History shows that the state as a special apparatus for coercing people arose only wherever and whenever there appeared a division of society into classes, that is, a division into groups of people, some of whom are permanently in a position to appropriate the labour of others, when some people exploit others.

And this division of society into classes must always be clearly borne in mind as a fundamental fact of history. The development of all human societies for thousands of years, in all countries without exception, reveals a general conformity to law, regularity and consistency in this development; so that at first we had a society without classes — the first patriarchal, primitive society, in which there were no aristocrats; then we had a society based on slavery — a slaveowning society. The whole of modern civilised Europe has passed through this stage — slavery ruled supreme 2,000 years ago. The vast majority of the people of other parts of the world also passed through this stage. Among the less developed peoples traces of slavery survive to this day! you will find the institution of slavery in Africa, for example, at the present time. Slaveowners and slaves were the first important class divisions. The former group not only owned all the means of production — the land and tools, however primitive they may have been in those times — but also owned people. This group was known as the slaveowners, while those who laboured and supplied labour for others were known as slaves.

This form was followed in history by another — feudalism. In the great majority of countries slavery evolved into feudalism. The fundamental divisions of society were now the feudal landlords and the peasant serfs. The form of relations between people changed. The slave-owners had regarded the slaves as their property; the law had confirmed this view and regarded the slave as a chattel completely owned by the slave-owner. As far as the present serf was concerned, class oppression and dependence remained, but it was not considered that the feudal landlord owned the peasants as chattels, but that he was only entitled to their labour and to compel them to perform certain services. In practice, as you know, feudalism, especially in Russia, where it survived longest of all and assumed the grossest forms, in no way differed from slavery.

Further, with the development of trade, the appearance of the world market and the development of money circulation, a new class arose within feudal society — the capitalist class. From the commodity, the exchange of commodities and the rise of the power of money, there arose the power of capital. During the eighteenth century — or rather, from the end of the eighteenth century and during the nineteenth century — revolutions took place all over the world. Feudalism was eliminated in all the countries of Western Europe. This took place latest of all in Russia. In 1861, (the year

in which the serfs were liberated in Russia. — Ed). a radical change took place in Russia as well, as a consequence of which one form of society was replaced by another — feudalism was replaced by capitalism, under which division into classes remained as well as various traces and relics of feudalism, but in which the division into classes fundamentally assumed a new form.

The owners of capital, the owners of the land, the owners of the mills and factories in all capitalist countries constituted and still constitute an insignificant minority of the population who have complete command of the labour of the whole people, and who therefore command, oppress and exploit the whole mass of labourers, the majority of whom are proletarians, wage-workers, that procure their livelihood in the process of production only by the sale of their labour power. With the transition to capitalism, the peasants, who were already impoverished and downtrodden in feudal times, were converted partly (the majority) into proletarians, and partly (the minority) into wealthy peasants, who themselves hired workers and who constituted a rural bourgeoisie.

This fundamental fact — the transition of society from primitive forms of slavery to feudalism and finally to capitalism — you must always bear in mind, for only by remembering this fundamental fact, only by inserting all political doctrines into this fundamental framework will you be able properly to appraise these doctrines and to understand what they refer to; for each of these great periods in the history of mankind — slave-owning, feudal and capitalist — embraces scores and hundreds of centuries and presents such a mass of political forms, such a variety of political doctrines, opinions and revolutions that we can understand this extreme diversity and immense variety — especially in connection with the political, philosophical and other doctrines of bourgeois scholars and politicians — only if we firmly hold to the guiding thread, this division of society into classes and this change in the forms of class rule, and from this standpoint examine all social questions — economic, political, spiritual, religious, etc.

If you examine the state from the standpoint of this fundamental division, you will find that before the division of society into classes, as I have already said, no state existed. But as the social division into classes arose and took firm root, as class society arose, the state also arose and took firm root. The history of mankind knows scores and hundreds of countries that have passed through, and are still passing through, slavery, feudalism and capitalism. In each of these countries, despite the immense historical changes that have taken place, despite all the political vicissitudes and all the revolutions associated with this development of mankind, in the transition from slavery through feudalism to capitalism, and to the present world-wide struggle against capitalism, you will always discern the rise of the state. It has always been a certain apparatus which separated out from society and consisted of a group of people en-

gaged solely, or almost solely, or mainly, in ruling. People are divided into ruled and into specialists in ruling, those who rise above society and are called rulers, representatives of the state.

This apparatus, this group of people who rule others, always takes command of a certain apparatus of coercion, of physical force, irrespective of whether this coercion of people is expressed in the primitive club, or—in the epoch of slavery—in more perfected types of weapons, or in the firearms which appeared in the Middle Ages, or, finally, in modern weapons, which, in the twentieth century, are marvels of technique and are entirely based on the latest achievements of modern technology.

The methods of coercion changed, but whenever there was a state there existed in every society a group of persons who ruled, who commanded, who dominated, and who, in order to maintain their power, possessed an apparatus of physical coercion, an apparatus of violence, with those weapons which corresponded to the technical level of the given epoch. And by examining these general phenomena, by asking ourselves why no state existed when there were no classes, when there were no exploiters and exploited, and why it arose when classes arose—only in this way shall we find a definite answer to the question of the essence of the state and its significance.

The state is a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over the slaves. Both society and the state were then much the epoch of slavery, people laboured in primitive conditions of greater equality; in conditions when productivity of labour was still at its lowest, and when primitive man could barely procure the wherewithal for the crudest and most primitive existence, a special group of people, especially separated off to rule and dominate over the rest of society, had not yet arisen, and could not have arisen. Only when the first form of the division of society into classes appeared, only when slavery appeared, when a certain class of people, by concentrating on the crudest forms of agricultural labour, could produce a certain surplus, when this surplus was not absolutely essential for the most wretched existence of the slave and passed into the hands of the slaveowner, when in this way the existence of this class of slave-owners took firm root — then in order that it might take firm root, it was essential that a state should appear.

And this state did appear — the slaveowning state, an apparatus which gave the slaveowners power and enabled them to rule over the slaves. Both society and the state were then much smaller than they are now, they possessed an incomparably weaker apparatus of communication — the modern means of communication did not then exist. Mountains, rivers and seas were immeasurably greater obstacles than they are now, and the formation of the state was confined within far narrower geographical boundaries. A technically weak state apparatus served a state confined within relatively narrow boundaries and a narrow circle of action. Never-

theless, there did exist an apparatus which compelled the slaves to remain in slavery, which kept one part of society subjugated to, and oppressed by, another. It is impossible to compel the greater part of society to work systematically for the other part of society without a permanent apparatus of coercion. So long as there were no classes, there was no apparatus like this. When classes appeared, everywhere and always as this division grew and took firmer hold, there also appeared a special institution — the state.

The forms of state were extremely varied. During the period of slavery we already find diverse forms of the state in the most advanced, cultured and most civilised countries, according to the standards of the time, for example, in ancient Greece and Rome, which rested entirely on slavery. At that time the difference was already arising between the monarchy and the republic, between the aristocracy and the democracy. A monarchy is the power of a single person, a republic is the absence of any non-elected power; an aristocracy is the power of a relatively small minority, a democracy is the power of the people (democracy in Greek literally means the power of the people). All these differences arose in the epoch of slavery. Despite these differences, the state in slave times was a slave state, irrespective of whether it was a monarchy or a republic, aristocratic or democratic.

In every course on the history of modern times, when hearing a lecture on this subject you will hear about the struggle which was waged between the monarchical and republican states. But the fundamental fact is that the slaves were not regarded as human beings—they were not only not regarded as citizens, but not even as human beings. Roman law regarded them as chattels. The law on murder, not to mention the other laws for the protection of the person, did not extend to slaves. It defended only the slaveowners, who were alone recognised as citizens with full rights. But whether a monarchy was instituted or a republic, it was a monarchy of the slaveowners or a republic of the slaveowners. All rights under them were enjoyed by the slaveowners, while the slave was a chattel in the eyes of the law; and not only could any sort of violence be perpetrated against a slave, but even the murder of a slave was not considered a crime.

Slaveowning republics differed in their internal organisation: There were aristocratic republics and democratic republics. In an aristocratic republic a small number of privileged persons took part in the elections; in a democratic republic everybody took part in the elections — but again only the slaveowners, everybody except the slaves. This fundamental fact must be borne in mind, because it throws more light than any other on the question of the state and clearly demonstrates the nature of the state.

The state is a machine for the oppression of one class by another, a machine for keeping in subjugation to one class other, subordinated classes. There are various forms of this machine. In the

slave-owning state we had a monarchy, an aristocratic republic, or even a democratic republic. In fact, the forms of government varied extremely, but their essence was always the same: the slaves enjoyed no rights and constituted an oppressed class; they were not regarded as human beings. We find the same state of affairs in the feudal state.

The change in the form of exploitation transformed the slave state into the feudal state. This was of immense importance. In slave society the slave enjoys no rights whatsoever and is not regarded as a human being; in feudal society the peasant is tied to the soil. The chief feature of feudalism was that the peasants (and at that time the peasants constituted the majority; there was a very poorly developed urban population) were considered attached, or in fee, to the land — hence the term feudalism. The peasant might work a definite number of days for himself on the plot assigned to him by the landlord; on the other days the peasant serf worked for this lord. The essence of class society remained: society was based on class exploitation. Only the landlords could enjoy full rights; the peasants had no rights at all. In practice their condition differed very little from the condition of slaves in the slave state.

Nevertheless, a wider road was opened for their emancipation, for the emancipation of the peasants, since the peasant serf was not regarded as the direct property of the landlord. He could work part of his time on his own plot, could, so to speak, belong to himself to a certain extent; and with the wider opportunities for the development of exchange and trade relations the feudal system steadily disintegrated and the scope of emancipation of the peasantry steadily widened. Feudal society was always more complex than slave society. There was a greater element of the development of trade and industry, which, even in those days led to capitalism. In the Middle Ages, feudalism predominated. And here too the forms of state differed, here too we find both monarchies and republics, although much more weakly expressed. But always the feudal landlord was regarded as the only ruler. The peasant serfs were absolutely excluded from all political rights.

Both under slavery and under the feudal system, the small minority of people could not dominate over the vast majority without coercion. History is full of the constant attempts of the oppressed classes to rid themselves of oppression. The history of slavery contains records of wars of emancipation from slavery which lasted for decades. Incidentally, the name 'Spartacist' (The Spartacists were the left wing of the German Social-Democratic Party, led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg.—Ed.) now adopted by the German Communists — the only German party which is really fighting the yoke of capitalism — was adopted by them because Spartacus was one of the most prominent heroes of one of the greatest revolts of slaves which took place about two

thousand years ago. For many years the apparently omnipotent Roman Empire, which rested entirely on slavery, experienced the shocks and blows of a vast uprising of slaves who armed and united to form a vast army under the leadership of Spartacus. In the end they were defeated, captured and tortured by the slave-owners.

Such civil wars mark the whole history of the existence of class society. I have just mentioned an example of the greatest of these civil wars in the epoch of slavery. The whole epoch of feudalism is likewise marked by constant uprisings of the peasants. For example, in Germany in the Middle Ages the struggle between the two classes — the landlords and the serfs — assumed wide dimensions and was transformed into a civil war of the peasants against the landlords. You are familiar with similar examples of repeated uprisings of the peasants against the feudal landlords in Russia.

In order to maintain their rule and to preserve their power, the landlords had to have an apparatus by which they could subjugate a vast number of people and subordinate them to certain laws and regulations: and all these laws fundamentally amounted to one thing — the maintenance of the power of the landlords over the peasant serfs. And this was the feudal state, which, in Russia, for example, or in extremely backward Asiatic countries, where feudalism prevails to this day — it differed in form — was either republican or monarchical. When the state was a monarchy, the rule of one person was recognised; when it was a republic, the participation in one degree or another of the elected representatives of landlord society was recognised — this was in feudal society. Feudal society represented a division of classes under which the vast majority — the peasant serfs—were completely subjected to an insignificant minority — the landlords, who owned the land.

The development of trade, the development of commodity exchange, led to the crystallisation of a new class —the capitalists. Capital arose at the close of the Middle Ages, when, after the discovery of America, world trade developed enormously, when the quantity of precious metals increased, when silver and gold became the means of exchange, when money circulation made it possible for individuals to hold tremendous wealth. Silver and gold were recognised as wealth all over the world. The economic power of the landlord class declined and the power of the new class—the representatives of capital — developed. The reconstruction in society was such that all citizens supposedly became equal, the old division into slaveowners and slaves disappeared, all were regarded as equal before the law irrespective of what capital they owned; whether they owned land as private property, or were starvelings who owned nothing but their labour power — they were all equal before the law. The law protects everybody equally; it protects the property of those who have it from attack by the masses who, possessing no property, possessing nothing but their labour power, grow steadily impoverished and ruined and become converted into proletarians.

Such is capitalist society.

I cannot dwell on it in detail. You will return to this question when you come to discuss the programme of the Party—you will then hear a description of capitalist society. This society advanced against serfdom, against the old feudal system, under the slogan of liberty. But it was liberty for those who owned property. And when feudalism was shattered, which occurred at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century—it occurred in Russia later than in other countries, in 1861 — the feudal state was superseded by the capitalist state, which proclaims liberty for the whole people as its slogan, which declares that it expresses the will of the whole people and denies that it is a class state. And here there developed a struggle between the Socialists, who are fighting for the liberty of the whole people, and the capitalist state—a struggle which has now led to the creation of the Soviet Socialist Republic and which embraces the whole world.

To understand the struggle that has been started against world capital, to understand the essence of the capitalist state, we must remember that when the capitalist state advanced against the feudal state, it entered the fight under the slogan of liberty. The abolition of feudalism meant liberty for the representatives of the capitalist state and served their purpose, inasmuch as feudalism was breaking down and the peasants had acquired the opportunity of owning as their full property the land which they had purchased for compensation or in part by quit rent — this did not concern the state; it protected property no matter how it arose, since it rested on private property. The peasants became private owners in all the modern civilised states. Even when the landlord surrendered part of his land to the peasant, the state protected private property, rewarding the landlord by compensation, sale for money. The state, as it were, declared that it would fully preserve private property, and it accorded it every support and protection. The state recognised the property rights of every merchant, industrialist and manufacturer. And this society, based on private property, on the power of capital, on the complete subjection of the propertyless workers and labouring masses of the peasantry, proclaimed that its rule was based on liberty. Combatting feudalism it proclaimed freedom of property and was particularly proud of the fact that the state had supposedly ceased to be a class state.

Yet the state continued to be a machine which helped the capitalists to hold the poor peasants and the working class in subjection. But externally it was free. It proclaimed universal suffrage, and declared through its champions, preachers, scholars and philosophers that it was not a class state. Even now, when the Soviet Socialist Republics have begun to fight it, they accuse us of violating liberty, of building a state based on coercion, on the suppression of certain people by others, whereas they represent a popular, democratic

state. And now, when the world Socialist revolution has begun, and just when the revolution has succeeded in certain countries, when the fight against world capital has grown particularly acute, this question of the state has acquired the greatest importance, and has become, one might say, the most burning one, the focus of all political questions and of all political disputes of the present day.

Whatever party we take in Russia, or in any of the more civilised countries, we find that nearly all political disputes, disagreements and opinions now centre around the conception of the state. Is the state in a capitalist country, in a democratic republic—especially one like Switzerland or America—in the freest democratic republics, an expression of the popular will, the sum total of the general decision of the peoples, the expression of the national will, and so forth; or is the state a machine that enables the capitalists of the given country to maintain their power over the working class and the peasantry? That is the fundamental question around which all political disputes all over the world now centre.

What do they say about Bolshevism? The bourgeois press abuses the Bolsheviks. You will not find a single newspaper which does not repeat the current accusation that the Bolsheviks violate popular rule. If our Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in their simplicity of heart (perhaps it is not simplicity, or perhaps it is the simplicity which they say is worse than robbery) think that they discovered and invented the accusation that the Bolsheviks have violated liberty and popular rule, they are ludicrously mistaken. Today, not a single one of the rich newspapers in the wealthy countries, which spend tens of millions on their distribution and disseminate bourgeois lies and the imperialist policy in tens of millions of copies — there is not one of these newspapers which does not repeat these fundamental arguments and accusations against Bolshevism, namely, that America, England and Switzerland are advanced states based on popular rule, whereas the Bolshevik Republic is a state of bandits in which liberty is unknown and that the Bolsheviks have violated the idea of popular rule and have even gone so far as to disperse the Constituent Assembly.

These terrible accusations against the Bolsheviks are repeated all over the world. These accusations bring us fully up against the question — what is the state? In order to understand these accusations, in order to examine them and have a fully intelligent attitude towards them, and not to examine them on hearsay but with a firm opinion of our own, we must have a clear idea of what the state is. Here we have capitalist states of every kind and the theories in defence of them which were created before the war. In order to proceed to answer the question properly we must critically examine all these doctrines and views.

I have already advised you to turn for help to Engels' book, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. This

book says that every state in which private property in land and in the means of production exists, in which capital prevails, however democratic it may be, is a capitalist state, a machine used by the capitalists to keep the working class and the poor peasants in subjection; while universal suffrage, a Constituent Assembly, parliament are merely a form, a sort of promissory note, which does not alter matters in any essential way.

The forms of domination of the state may vary; capital manifests its power in one way where one form exists, and in another way where another form exists — but essentially the power is in the hands of capital, whether there are voting qualifications or not, or whether the republic is a democratic one or not — in fact, the more democratic it is the cruder and more cynical is the rule of capitalism. One of the most democratic republics in the world is the United States of America, yet nowhere (and those who were there after 1905 probably know it) is the power of capital, the power of a handful of billionaires over the whole of society, so crude and so openly corrupt as in America. Once capital exists, it dominates the whole of society, and no democratic republic, no form of franchise can alter the essence of the matter.

The democratic republic and universal suffrage were a great progressive advance on feudalism: they have enabled the proletariat to achieve its present unity and solidarity, to form those firm and disciplined ranks which are waging a systematic struggle against capital. There was nothing even approximately resembling this among the peasant serfs, not to speak of the slaves. The slaves, as we know, revolted, rioted, started civil wars, but they could never create a class-conscious majority and parties to lead the struggle, they could not clearly realise what they were aiming for, and even in the most revolutionary moments of history they were always pawns in the hands of the ruling classes. The bourgeois republic, parliament, universal suffrage all represent great progress from the standpoint of the world development of society. Mankind moved towards capitalism and it was capitalism alone which, thanks to urban culture, enabled the oppressed class of proletarians to learn to know itself and to create the world working class movement, the millions of workers who are organised all over the world in parties — the Socialist parties which are consciously leading the struggle of the masses. Without parliamentarianism, without elections, this development of the working class would have been impossible. That is why all these things have acquired such great importance in the eyes of the broad masses of people. That is why a radical change seems to be so difficult.

It is not only the conscious hypocrites, scientists and priests that uphold and defend the bourgeois lie that the state is free and that it is its duty to defend the interests of all, but also a large number of people who sincerely adhere to the old prejudices and

who cannot understand the transition from the old capitalist society to socialism. It is not only people who are directly dependent on the bourgeoisie, not only those who are oppressed by the yoke of capital or who have been bribed by capital (there are a large number of all sorts of scientists, artists, priests, etc., in the service of capital), but even people who are simply under the sway of the prejudice of bourgeois liberty that have taken up arms against Bolshevism all over the world because of the fact that when it was founded the Soviet Republic rejected these bourgeois lies and openly declared; you say that your state is free, whereas in reality, as long as there is private property, your state, even if it is a democratic republic, is nothing but a machine used by the capitalists to suppress the workers, and the freer the state, the more clearly is this expressed.

Examples of this are Switzerland in Europe and the United States in the Americas. Nowhere does capital rule so cynically and ruthlessly and nowhere is this so apparent, as in these countries, although they are democratic republics, no matter how finely they are painted and notwithstanding all the talk about labour democracy and the equality of all citizens. The fact is that in Switzerland and America capital dominates, and every attempt of the workers to achieve the slightest real improvement in their condition is immediately met by civil war. There are fewer soldiers, a small standing army in these countries — Switzerland has a militia and every Swiss has a gun at home, while in America there was no standing army until quite recently — and so when there is a strike the bourgeoisie arms, hires soldiers and suppresses the strike; and nowhere is this suppression of the working-class movement accompanied by such ruthless severity as in Switzerland and in America, and nowhere does the influence of capital in parliament manifest itself as powerfully as in these countries. The power of capital is everything, the stock exchange is everything, while parliament and elections are marionettes, puppets . . . But the eyes of the workers are being opened more and more, and the idea of Soviet government is spreading wider and wider, especially after the bloody carnage through which we have just passed. The necessity for a merciless war on the capitalists is becoming clearer and clearer to the working class.

Whatever forms a republic may assume, even the most democratic republic, if it is a bourgeois republic, if it retains private property in land, mills and factories, and if private capital keeps the whole of society in wage slavery, that is, if it does not carry out what is proclaimed in the programme of our Party and in the Soviet Constitution, then this state is a machine for the suppression of certain people by others. And we shall place this machine in the hands of the class that is to overthrow the power of capital. We shall reject all the old prejudices about the state meaning universal equality. That is a fraud; as long as there is exploitation, there cannot be

equality. The landlord cannot be the equal of the worker, the hungry man the equal of the full man. The proletariat casts aside the machine which was called the state and before which people bowed in superstitious awe, believing the old tales that it means popular rule — the proletariat casts aside this machine and declares that it is a bourgeois lie. We have deprived the capitalists of this machine and have taken it over. With this machine, or bludgeon, we shall destroy all exploitation. And when the possibility of exploitation no longer exists anywhere in the world, when there are no longer owners of land and owners of factories, and when there is no longer a situation in which some gorge while others starve — only when the possibility of this no longer exists shall we consign this machine to the scrap heap. Then there will be no state and no exploitation. Such is the view of our Communist Party. I hope that we shall return to this subject in subsequent lectures, and return to it again and again.

(NOTE): This article is the text of a lecture to the students of Sverdlov University, delivered by V. I. Lenin on July 11, 1919, as a general introduction to the subject of the state. In this lecture, Lenin did not attempt to go into the question of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine nor with the vital necessity of the proletariat to establish, strengthen and maintain its own state machine as the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat during the whole period of socialist society. These questions, the importance of which has been highlighted by the attempts of the modern revisionists to distort and negate them, are dealt with by Lenin in other works, notably: "The State and Revolution").



The Struggle for the Triumph of Marxism-Leninism over Bourgeois Ideology

**THE MOTIVE FORCE OF THE
REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT WORLD-WIDE**

(Contributed).

In the world today, the struggle between the two lines, the struggle for the triumph of the Marxist-Leninist line, policy and ideology over all different varieties of the bourgeois line, policy and ideology, is expressed in every aspect of life. Not only is it all-pervading, in the life of the members and organisations of a small revolutionary party in a capitalist country, such as the C.P.N.Z., but it finds expression with even greater intensity within the revolutionary parties in the countries where the revolution has triumphed and the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established. This is an objective law which will operate during the entire historical era in which any source of bourgeois ideology continues to exist in the world.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China was a manifestation of this struggle which is now well known. In this mighty revolutionary movement, the working masses of China exposed, criticised and smashed the attempts of bourgeois elements centred around Liu Shao Chi, who had tried to seize power within the Communist Party of China and to turn the People's Republic of China back to the road of capitalism. The attempt to destroy the proletarian revolution through revisionist degeneration was defeated. Through the vigilance and action of the working masses Marxist-Leninist ideology triumphed over bourgeois ideology. Subsequent events have shown that only by maintaining this vigilance and mobilisation of the masses can the continuing attacks of the class enemy be repulsed.

Less well-known are the efforts of the Albanian communists in this world-wide struggle.

The imperialists and the revisionists are exerting tremendous pressure on the Party of Labour of Albania and on the People's Republic of Albania. In face of the unity and military preparedness of the Albanian people to defend their revolutionary gains, the imperialists and revisionists appear to have put aside, for the moment, their plans to destroy the Albanian revolution by external military force and are concentrating all their efforts on "taking the castle

from within" by inciting ideological degeneration and to lull the Albanian's vigilance.

NEW IMPERIALIST-REVISIONIST LINE

All the imperialist-revisionist propaganda machinery is pushing the line that today "post industrial capitalist society" and "fully developed socialist society" are inevitably heading for the same goal of an "affluent society" achieved through the technical-scientific revolution. Hence, the fundamental antagonisms between the proletariat and the capitalist class, between socialism and imperialism, it is suggested, no longer really exist and the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat are out-dated concepts from an earlier era. Therefore, all should now be sweetness and enlightenment, a time for relaxation of tensions. The U.S.A., Britain, the U.S.S.R., are all pursuing this line in making approaches to the People's Republic of Albania, whose continued existence in Europe and whose tremendously successful development of socialist society under the dictatorship of the proletariat, strikes the only disharmonious chord amidst the sickly-sweet melodies of the imperialist-revisionist chorus.

GERMAN REVANCHISM

The Albanians believe that the reality of the world situation is quite the reverse of the way the imperialists and revisionists portray it. In the struggle and alliance between the two super-powers for domination of the world and its division into spheres of influence, West Germany has now emerged to challenge for hegemony in Europe and then in the whole world. The U.S. imperialists started the rebuilding of German revanchism to use it as a gendarme of U.S. imperialism in Europe. The revisionists' concessions over a treaty to end World War Two, over Berlin, and the moves to reunification of Germany under West German imperialist domination, more becoming mercenaries paid by the West German imperialists to military-political power and a grave threat to peace in the world.

The Americans thought that the presence of their armed forces in Germany could guarantee U.S. domination of the German imperialist machine, but with the decline of U.S. imperialist power and the collapse of the dollar, these U.S. troops in Europe are more and more becoming mercenaries paid by the West German imperialists to support West German imperialist aims.

The only state in Europe which is describing this reality in unequivocal terms is the People's Republic of Albania, although a number of other states, seeing the growing threat to their independence, are murmuring "hear, hear", in the background, while the revolutionary and progressive forces are more and more clearly seeing that the line of the Party of Labour of Albania and the People's Republic of Albania represents the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line which they must fight to support.

Apart from the stepping up of their attacks on Albanian policies through the press and radio and the activation of their old agency, the Vatican to this end, the imperialists have ringed Albania with powerful T.V. stations. There are three on the Greek border, facing the Albanian cities of Saranda, Gjirokaster and Korcha, one in Kosova of Yugoslavia which broadcasts in the Albanian language, plus the Italian stations just across the Adriatic Sea.

NEW LEVEL OF IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

The Party of Labour has responded by raising the struggle in the ideological revolution to an unprecedented level. Starting within the Party, a vigorous struggle has been launched to raise the ideological level of the membership, to increase the militancy and mobilisation of all the communists against the feeling of self-satisfaction and resting on their laurels, to eliminate certain trends towards liberalism and conservatism. Led by the Party organisations, a great mass campaign to examine practice, exposing the roots of incorrect attitudes and methods of work has set the whole population ablaze. Some cadres who had shown signs of ideological degeneration have been criticised and replaced. The active participation of the broad masses of the people in the struggle to fulfill their tasks in production, to establish proletarian discipline on the jobs, improving quality, overcoming absenteeism, developing new methods, fighting bureaucracy, laziness and corruption, has become a mighty movement whose only parallel in history is the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China.

Certain bourgeois trends developing in literature, art and music, have come under mass criticism, while in February-March this year a great popular initiative to take down the special antennae necessary to pick up Yugoslav T.V. swept the country. At the same time, criticisms of Albanian radio and T.V. programmes have been acted upon and the local services are enormously better than they were one year ago.

In brief, there is a great qualitative leap forward in the political activation of the broad masses of the Albanian people. That is why the revolutionary situation in that country is excellent. The increased vigilance of the masses has resulted in the exposure of some hostile activities by isolated elements of the internal class enemy, but in this situation these remnants of the former exploiting classes in general are obliged to lie very low.

OUTSTANDING PROGRESS

Each day marks new successes in the completion of the great construction projects of the fifth five-year plan of economic development. And this is proceeding at ever-increasing rates precisely because of the triumph of Marxism-Leninism in the sphere of ideology with the emergence of the new socialist man equipped with the Marxist-Leninist world outlook and communist morality. The

proletarian revolutionary ideology, Marxism-Leninism, is triumphant in Albania, but the Albanian communists and the Albanian people know full well that this situation can be maintained only through unflagging vigilance and constant struggle. As a popular saying puts it: "The waters may sleep, but the enemy, never".

It can be seen that the struggle between the two lines, the struggle for the revolutionary new, uniting the whole Party membership around the concrete application of its policy, examination of its practice to sort out what is correct and revolutionary and what is incorrect and reactionary, consciously striving to make Marxism-Leninism predominant in everything, is a universal principle, applicable in the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania, just as it is in the Communist Party of New Zealand.

Albanian Youth— A Revolutionary Task Force

— Enver Hoxha.

(Extract from Report to the 6th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania).

The Party has done fruitful work in the struggle for the education of the new man, especially for the Communist education of our youth.

Our Youth are closely linked with the Party, politically clear and morally pure, correctly orientated and secure in life, bold and courageous fighters, who pour out their precious energies for the benefit of the socialist revolution and the all-round progress of the people.

BOURGEOIS AND REVISIONIST DEGENERATION

We see quite another picture in the capitalist and revisionist world. There, the problem of the youth today is one of the most disturbing problems. The youth feel the crisis of this rotten society and seek a way out. Time after time they throw themselves into various revolutionary actions in this struggle. But they are benumbed, fed with the feeling of spiritual emptiness and futility, led on to the road of dissipation and degeneration, their energies consumed in a life devoid of ideals or prospects.

The bourgeoisie uses all its means, from children's toys to the

press and literature, from the school to the church, to corrupt the masses of the youth and the people, to give this corruption the appearance of an alleged "free" and "modern" life, to divert the youth from politics, from the struggle for the future, from revolution.

The bourgeoisie and its propaganda machine consider honour, the life of modesty and dignity, lofty and pure morality, loyalty to the working people and the fatherland, all the fine revolutionary virtues of the people, anachronistic and archaic. They are combatted directly and obliquely, demagogically distorted and adapted to the interests of the bourgeoisie and to the detriment of the working people, to quell revolutionary revolt, to cope with the influence of Marxist-Leninism, which is the defender of this great spiritual wealth of the people.

The bourgeois and revisionist ideologists try to convince the youth and the masses that it is useless to fight and seek a way out from the deep contradictions eroding their society. The only alternative they offer is to plunge into pessimism and corruption. Herein lies the source of the unscrupulous incitement, with disastrous social consequences, to alcoholism, narcotics, sexuality and many low and beastly instincts which have become the fashion in the capitalist and revisionist world.

ALBANIAN YOUTH — VANGUARD FIGHTERS

In absolute contrast to this situation, the younger generation, rallied in our country round its own militant organisation, the Labour Youth Union of Albania, under the leadership of the Party, has come out on the arena of the ideological class struggle as a courageous initiator and unyielding fighter, as a revolutionary shock force, driving ahead in the field of social, ideological and cultural transformations.

Our heroic youth, guarding itself against the influences of bourgeois and revisionist ideology, has at the same time marched and is marching boldly in the front ranks of the struggle against all those traditions of the old world, which have become outdated, against everything alien that hinders our advance. In this struggle, the personality of the youth has increased and is increasing every day, its courage and revolutionary initiative are growing, its experience is being enriched . . .

We should not forget that the bourgeois and revisionist ideology is spearheaded in the first place against the youth, which from lack of experience, may become more vulnerable.

Therefore, our Party will fight, in the future, too, to throw the youth into struggle against any influence of alien ideology, to nurture it consistently with the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist ideals, to widen the scope and horizons for its inexhaustible energies in every field, to encourage its initiative and self-action on a large scale.

People's War

(Part 4)

General Vo Nguyen Giap

(Excerpts from "Viet Nam Courier", August, 1972).

ROLE OF REVOLUTIONARY ARMY

A revolutionary army with a certain level of organisation is necessary as a spearhead for assaulting and wiping out a part of the enemy troops and administration, paralysing and disintegrating enemy forces wherever they oppose the insurrection; only then can one encourage the masses to rush forward and generate favourable conditions for the success of the general insurrection.

The main forces of an insurrection are constituted by the political forces of the armed masses; but the support of a revolutionary army proves to be a great stimulus for the latter and more favourable conditions are thus created for the success of the insurrection.

The August Revolution was the first victory of Marxism-Leninism in a colonial and semi-feudal country. It proves that in the favourable international conjuncture of our era, a small, oppressed people is wholly capable of rising up and carrying out an armed insurrection to seize power and overthrow the yoke of the imperialists and colonialists in spite of their huge coercive apparatuses and professional armies equipped with modern armaments.

THE ANTI - FRENCH RESISTANCE

In the anti-French resistance, our people managed to cleverly combine armed forces with political forces, which made up the basis. The armed forces, with three categories of troops, were the nucleus of the resistance, while judiciously allying armed struggle with political struggle, armed combat with popular uprising, our people have always looked upon armed struggle as the essential form of struggle.

During the resistance, our Party strove to build up popular armed forces. On the basis of the people's political forces, themselves grounded on the worker-peasant alliance, our armed forces, born in the pre-insurrectional period, developed by leaps and bounds in the first year of people's power, then experienced a rapid growth during the protracted resistance in which they became battle-seasoned. The liberation troops became the Viet Nam People's Army, the regular army of our State. Self-defence and guerrilla formations ceaselessly developed.

TASK OF THE REGULAR FORCES

The regular forces were operating on important war theatres in the country. Their task was to destroy the bulk of the enemy's forces, especially his strategic mobile forces, to deal him devastating

blows, to liberate territory, and by uniting their efforts with the guerrillas', to bring about a change in the character of the war likely to break his aggressive will. The regular forces and regular warfare also created conditions for guerrilla war to develop and stimulated the political struggle and armed uprisings of the masses as well as the agitation and persuasion work carried out among enemy troops and officials.

During the anti-French resistance our regular forces, which included only small detachments at the start, evolved to become mobile strategic forces comprising well-tempered units with ever-improved equipment and training, highly combative spirit and great fighting ability, capable of annihilating several enemy battalions and regiments in a single battle. Going into action for the first time in the 1950 campaign on the Sino-Vietnamese frontier, then in other great battles in Hoa Binh and in the north-west, etc., our mobile groups closely co-operated with the regional armed forces and all three categories of troops played a great role in impelling the resistance forward.

The battle of Dien Bien Phu marked a big advance in the build-up of our mobile strategic forces. While our armed forces and people were achieving great victories on other important fronts, our battle-seasoned mobile groups equipped with technical means and supported by the whole people wiped out at Dien Bien Phu the enemy's most powerful entrenched camp in Indo-China.

Set up in compliance with the actual conditions and concrete tasks of each theatre of operations, the regional forces made up the core of local armed struggle. Built up into strong units, they fought in either concentrated or scattered formations in close co-ordination with the people's militia and the regular forces in order to annihilate the enemy, keep up and develop the guerrilla war, combine their action with the masses' political struggle and uprisings, foil the enemy's schemes for penning up people and impressing them into puppet units, protect the people, the revolutionary power and the human and material resources of the resistance.

Born of armed propaganda platoons, independent companies and grouped battalions during the first years of the resistance, the provincial and district regional forces ceaselessly developed. Their armaments and equipment improved with each passing day, mainly thanks to captured enemy material. Whole enemy platoons and companies were often wiped out and enemy posts stormed by the regional troops, which toward the end of the resistance even succeeded in annihilating whole enemy battalions.

PEOPLE'S MILITIA

As broadly-based popular armed forces, the people's militia conducted guerrilla warfare in concert with the regional forces and co-operated with the masses' political forces in exterminating local bullies and traitors and staging uprisings for seizing power at the

base. They did not give up production work, were acquainted with the use of all available arms, and attacked the enemy on the spot in the diverse ways devised by themselves, wearing him out and annihilating his forces in villages and streets, wherever they appeared, even in their rear areas. Guerrilla forces and guerrilla warfare constituted the basis on which to build a popular army and wage regular warfare.

Guerrilla units were vigorously growing in strength and combat capabilities. Relying on resisting villages, using rudimentary weapons which were gradually improved, they wiped out whole enemy squads, platoons and even companies towards the end of the resistance. Together with the regional forces, they played a more and more important role in the building up, maintenance and widening of guerrilla zones and bases as well as in protecting the liberated zones by breaking up the enemy's raids and encroachments while impelling people's war in their localities.

Organisational relations between the regular troops, regional troops and guerrilla militia in the process of development of the revolutionary armed forces, as well as co-ordination between the three categories of troops and between the people's army and the masses' armed forces, were closely bound to the evolution of the resistance from guerrilla to regular warfare as well as to the close co-ordination between these two forms of warfare.

CO-ORDINATION OF ALL FORCES

The experience of the anti-French resistance shows that co-ordination between the regular troops, regional troops and guerrilla militia, between regular and guerrilla warfare, is a great asset of peoples' war in mobilising the masses and giving full play to the strength derived from a just war, the liberation war, fought on our own territory.

This co-ordination has prevented the aggressors' professional armies, in spite of their large numbers and modern equipment, from waging a classical war likely to allow them to fully deploy their power and strength. The aggressors' armies face not only a revolutionary army but also an entire people who are resolutely resisting on all fronts. They get caught in the sea of people's war, a war with neither front nor rear, a war in which the front is nowhere and yet everywhere. The contradictions inherent in all aggressive wars, those between dispersal and concentration, between occupation of ground and mobility, grow sharper and sharper. The aggressors not only fail to destroy the people's armed forces but are continuously nibbled at, worn out, annihilated in increasing numbers and finally worsted.

This resistance of the whole people on all fronts defeated the French imperialists' aggressive army which was nearly half a million strong and equipped with up-to-date war means.

This first victory ever won in a national-liberation war fought

in a colonised country showed that in our times, a small nation which is neither wide in area nor numerous in population and has an underdeveloped economy is fully capable, by launching a revolutionary war, of defeating the imperialists' old-type colonialist aggressive war.

The new development of the popular armed forces takes place within the framework of the historical development of the north. It is the military organisation for national defence of an independent state in a process of peaceful socialist construction. Its function is to serve as an instrument of the State of proletarian dictatorship to defend socialist north Viet Nam and carry out its revolutionary task in all the country, while standing ready to check all sinister schemes of U.S. imperialism.

Our Party firmly upholds the conception of people's war and national defence by the entire people and strives to arm the entire people in the new conjuncture, to build up a powerful popular army while arming the revolutionary masses, thus strengthening all three categories of popular armed forces. Thanks to such widespread mass armed forces which are not severed from production work, and a well-trained popular army possessed of great combative force, we have at our disposal both a powerful national defence force and sufficient manpower to ensure production.

"GROUND AGAINST AIR"

Against U.S. aggression, our army and people in Socialist North Viet Nam have opposed a "ground against air" people's war which has proved to be resolute and effective.

It is a new type of people's war: the entire people fight enemy air and naval forces: the entire people take part in defence and production work; the entire people ensure communications and transport; the entire people are engaged in both fighting and production; the entire people defend the rear while serving the front.

We are waging a people's war on the basis of a socialist regime in its beginnings at a time when our people are possessed of a well-structured independent state, which has gone through ten years of consolidation and development in peace and enjoys considerable assistance from the brother socialist countries.

The people's militia and self-defence corps have played a great role. Their members, old and young, men and women, in the countryside and in the towns, from the delta to the highlands, have actively taken part in the fight against enemy planes, weaving everywhere a network of fire at low altitude. In co-ordination with the anti-aircraft and air forces they succeed in creating a mobile and flexible multi-tiered fire network covering the whole territory with special emphasis on key-points.

This fire network has accounted for a great number of U.S. planes shot down at various altitudes, over various terrains and in various circumstances. Militiamen have downed with rifle fire

many U.S. jets and captured many pilots. The hunt for enemy planes flying at low altitude, launched by people's militia and self-defence units, is a new form of guerrilla warfare in the "ground against air" people's war.

Militia units have also captured or wiped out many enemy commandos, destroyed or defused tens of thousands of bombs and mines. In the socialist regime, the masses, armed forces have proved their considerable combat capabilities.

Our people have actively taken part in the fighting by devoting millions of workdays to the building of roads and combat positions, first aid to the wounded, supply to the troops and support for the army; they have devoted themselves to economic and cultural development and to education and health work, and helped stabilise life in spite of the fierceness of the war. The revolutionary heroism of our army and people is evinced in both fighting and combat support, in efforts to ensure communications and transport, in people's anti-aircraft defence as well as in productive work and the building of a new life.

(To be continued).